



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. .
09/628,599	07/28/2000	Ian R. Finlay	12780-1015	3713

7590

07/15/2004

Sandra M Parker  
Attorney at Law  
329 La Jolla Aveune  
Long Beach, CA 90803

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/628,599

Applicant(s)

FINLAY ET AL.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2172

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-22.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

  
ALFORD KINDRED  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation Pre-Processing has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Same Executable Function, a direct pointer to the function) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicants argued that, "Edwards does not have the quoted language ... from the claim 1 of the invention, with Edwards reference column and line numbers added in brackets." (Page 7, the 5<sup>th</sup>). Edwards et al. of 6,438,536 (hereinafter Edwards) teaches executable function performing by lower component layers and during processing of generating code for a specific SQL query, the code generation component layer inserts calls to the difference performance enhancing subroutines in place of normally included calls to lower component layer. Subroutines pass pointers to the generation code for retrieval information to get the results and a pointer to where the result should be returned to the function (see col. 7, lines 60-67 and col. 8, lines 30-38; also see abstract).

Applicants argued that, "Levine teaches away from the present invention and it does not explicitly teaches a direct call mechanism replacing a lookup function of a run-time interpreter." (Page 10, lines 25-27). Levine of 6,105,033 teaches The director component contains routines that generate calls for searching or looking up the information if the codes for those statements are found or for deleting the code segment (col. 6, lines 12-26, col. 7, lines 1-30, and col. 8, lines 20-62; also see col. 14, lines 30-52) and at run time interpreting data data as a pointer to a generated code segment or to a data structure that contains the pointer to the code segment (see fig. 2, col. 5, lines 63-67 and col. 6, lines 1-26 and col. 8, lines 15-18).

Thus, Applicants' arguments are not persuasive with the record of prior art

BEST AVAILABLE COPY